

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Is it not a fact that a similar state of things exists in Dharwar College and if so, would it be possible for Government to incur extra expenditure by allowing the students to undergo the course elsewhere than in Mysore State?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—We will consider all that when the question is taken up. At the moment I only state that what the Committee considered. The Committee's consideration is quite different from Government taking any decision. Now I am thankful to the Hon'ble Members for the suggestions they have made. All these will be borne in mind when we examine the question.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Regarding the shifting of the College to V. C. Farm or any other place, may I ask whether the Government will find time to look into the actual report of the Committee appointed by the Government previously in 1949 before they act upon any of the conclusions to which reference has been made?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—That also will be borne in mind.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಮನಿಯಪ್ಪ.—Agricultural Industry ಯೆಂಬುದು ದೇಶದ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ದೇಶದ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೂಲಭೂತ ವಾದ industry ಯಲ್ಲವೇ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That needs no answer.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಮನಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ಉದ್ಯಮವನ್ನು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯದ ಕಾರ್ಲೇಜು ಅತ್ಯಾಪತ್ಯಕವಲ್ಲವೇ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I cannot answer. The Agricultural College from my point of view should serve the purpose for which it is meant. That it is not serving so to-day is the only grievance.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಮನಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಅದಕ್ಕೇನು ಕಾರಣವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು investigate ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಂದ Response ಇಲ್ಲ, ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಂದ Response ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಮನಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಹಾಗೆ Response ಬರದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯದ ಕಾರ್ಲೇಜಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ Prospects ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ

ಕಾರಣಗಳೇನೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಯಲು enquiry ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನೇನಾದರೂ ಮಾಡಿ ತಿಳಿದಿದ್ದೀರಾ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The only thing as I find is that the agricultural graduates are not finding their prospects better in Government service. That is one of the reasons why they are not coming forward.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Questions are over. The Hon'ble Home Minister wants to make some statement regarding Question No. 606.

Statement by Home Minister on Question No. 606.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—When I was answering supplementaries to question No. 606 tabled by Sri Huchmashy Gowda, the Hon'ble Member from Periyapatna made a statement to my regret that this Government for political reasons have not given licence to the mill in question which is referred to in answer (e), that is, rice mill in Manchanahally, Krishnarajanagar Taluk. You are pleased to give me this occasion to explain the circumstances that led to the not granting of licence this year to this mill and my only purpose now is to show the circumstances

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Is it by way of clarification or correction?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clarification. I ought to have allowed him to answer then alone, but I prevented him from answering with a view to avoid interruption.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—On 11th November 1952 Sri M. K. Ere Gowda, Proprietor of that Mill, gave a petition to me praying—to use his own words—to allow him to hull the paddy that is stored in his rice mill and to permit him to store paddy in the coming acquisition period pending the issue of a licence. Then that petition was referred to the Director of Food Supplies. The Director of Food Supplies in his report dated 12th December 1952 informed the Government that this rice mill had not

obtained any licence as required under the Act; that is under the Act called the Mysore Rice Control Order, 1951. That is No. 1.

Then he also informed the Government that out of the paddy that was allowed to be stocked there unauthorisedly, that is, without permission, 1,439 pallas of paddy were hulled by the rice mill without a licence on the plea that deterioration in the stock had set in and further he informed the Government that when the stock was verified on 11th November 1952 it was noticed that there was a shortage of 165 pallas and 20 seers of paddy. Further, the Government were also informed that this rice mill was built without any alienation proceedings as required under the law.

1-30 P.M.

When all these things were brought to the notice of the Government, they passed an Order. When I was approached on 15th December 1952, I heard the petitioner Sri Ere Gowda and explained to him how it is very difficult to grant licence in the particular case as prayed for, in view of the fact that he does not conform to the requirements of law. Moreover, the licensing authority is the Director of Food Supplies and he is the proper authority, whom the petitioner has to approach for the grant of a licence. The file was unofficially forwarded to the Director of Food Supplies for disposal according to law. This was the order that I passed. There is a very detailed report from the Deputy Commissioner—I do not want to take the valuable time of this House—wherein it is seen that as much as 6,295 pallas and 1 seer of paddy, which was acquired in that particular area, was stored within the precincts of this rice mill. Subsequently without permit this rice mill owner hulled a particular quantity. Sir, the matter is not yet concluded. I do not want to say anything more. It is before the Director of Food Supplies. The matter is under investigation as to who allowed, how they allowed it and

how did they allow them to get any licence. Under these circumstances, I am reluctant to say that the Hon'ble Member made allegations which are not warranted by facts. This Government has no political bias and has no political reasons. The Government has acted in a manner as it ought to act in a legal manner and I should say that the allegations made are unfounded.

QUESTION FOR ANSWER ON THE DAY

(but not taken up)

Converting the lands under the right bank low level channel fo K.R.S. from dry to permanent wet.

Q.—570. Sri SHIVANANJE GOWDA (Mysore Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) the reasons for not yet converting the lands under the right bank low level channel of Krishnarajasagar from dry to permanent wet;

(b) whether an order had not been passed during the time of Sri D. K. Darashah, the then Survey Superintendent, to treat as permanent wet lands all the dry lands under irrigation for over five years;

(c) whether they had not promised already on the floor of the Representative Assembly four years back that they would convert the said lands into permanent wet;

(d) the total amount realised at present per each acre of land by way of dry assessment, water rate, cesses, etc.?

A.—Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—

(a) As irrigation had not fully developed and settled in this tract, the levy of permanent wet rates was reserved for a re-classification of the entire area. Dry assessment and water rate are being recovered. During the Revision Settlement, lands